DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 923 FL 007 755

AUTHOR Davis, Nanette J.
TITLE The Case for Linguistic Determinism in Social Research. Papers from the Michigan Linguistic Society Meeting, Vol. 1, No. 2.
INSTITUTION Central Michigan Univ., Mount Pleasant. Dept. of English.
PUB DATE Oct 70
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Michigan Linguistic Society Meeting (October 3, 1970)
AVAILABLE FROM David Lawton, English Department, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859 ($3.00 each issue)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anthropology; Cross Cultural Studies; Diachronic Linguistics; *Language Role; Language Universals; *Linguistics; *Linguistic Theory; *Social Sciences; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociolinguistics; Sociology; Synchronic Linguistics
IDENTIFIERS *Linguistic Determinism

ABSTRACT

Social scientists have tended to neglect the relationship of language and "reality" in their formulations of mind, self, and society. Recently, however, a flurry of studies dealing with the congruence of language, cognition, and society has emerged. The initial sources of this concern may be traced to the rich tradition of the French school of Durkheim, the symbolic interaction perspective of American sociology, and the early efforts of Boas and his students in American Indian studies. But, perhaps an even greater impetus was furnished by the language-world view analysis. Humboldt, Boas, Cassirer, Sapir, Whorf, and Hoijer, among others, have been concerned with the character of language in its role as foundation and instrumentality of the social construction of reality. The so-called nominalistic, or extreme, interpretation of linguistic determinism, usually associated with the work of Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, will be reviewed in this paper to assess. (1) the present state of the linguistic determinism argument, (2) the research generated from this positions, (3) present trends in sociolinguistics, and (4) recent efforts to articulate a linguistically-based social science. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123923

THE CASE FOR LINGUISTIC DETERMINISM IN SOCIAL RESEARCH[1]

NANETTE J. DAVIS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Social scientists have tended to neglect the relationship of language and "reality" in their formulations of mind, self, and society. Recently, however, a flurry of studies dealing with the congruence of language, cognition, and society has emerged. The initial sources of this concern may be traced to the rich tradition of the French school of Durkheim, the symbolic interaction perspective of American sociology, and the early efforts of Boas and his students in American Indian studies. But, perhaps an even greater impetus was furnished by the language-world view analysis. Humboldt, Boas, Cassirer, Sapir, Whorf, and Hoijer, among others, have been concerned with the character of language in its role as foundation and instrumentality of the social construction of reality. The so-called nominalistic, or extreme, interpretation of linguistic determinism, usually associated with the work of Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, will be reviewed in this paper to assess: (1) the present state of the linguistic determinism argument, (2) the research generated from this positions, (3) present trends in sociolinguistics, and (4) recent efforts to articulate a linguistically-based social science.

Analysis of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis[2]

The notion that language is formative, as well as formed, provided the impetus for a conception of language as sui generis, or as a structure with its own particular set of principles which form a system. Rejecting the earlier assumptions of parallelism, Sapir postulated that language and culture were interpenetrable, and that a "virtual identity" or "close correspondence" prevails between word and thing. Language, in this context, not only refers to experience, but also, "actually defines experience" by reason of its formal completeness.

FL007755

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
English Dept, Cent. Mich. U.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Even more significant in this viewpoint, is that there is an unconscious projection of the implicit expectations that are built into the language, and thence carried into the field of experience. Man is bounded by his linguistic forms, even when he thinks himself most free.

The logical extension of th sui generis thesis is the assertion that people speaking different language may be said to live in different "worlds of reality" in that the languages they speak affect, to a considerable degree, both their sensory perceptions and their habitual modes of thought. The language-determines-reality argument has, then, its analogue in the view that each language and culture group is different from and contrasted to every other distinct language and culture group.

The "real world," in Sapir's conception, is not only mediated and conditioned by the language of the group, but is essentially a construction built on the language habits of the group. "The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds," Sapir asserted, "not merely the same world with different labels attached."[3] This linguistic relativism is a special type of cultural relativism whose special character lies in the central role assigned to linguistic patterns.

This perspective, later developed more fully by Whorf, led to the notion by some thinkers that man can only think what he can say.[4] The categories of his language are the means by which the categories of his perception, memory, social organization, and behavior are created. A difference in categories implies a difference in modes of thought, which no translation can bridge.

Whorf has been credited with this more extreme view of linguistic determinism, in spite of his cautious suggestions that researchers seek

"traceable affinities" between language and culture, rather than correlational or diagnostic correspondences. Our concern here, however, is with the implications for subsequent interpretation and research. What Whorf really said is another problem altogether.

Whorf's pioneering effort to establish linkages between linguistic and non-linguistic data aimed at generalizations that purported to show the integral interconnectedness between language, cognition, and culture. Whorf based his findings on a comparative analysis of Indian linguistic systems and SAE (Standard Average European). In focusing on grammatical forms to support his case of linguistic relativity, however, Whorf took the formal and the literal components of meanings as the basis for analysis. The users and uses of language were not considered in his scheme.

Language and world view (or metaphysical assumptions) is a central theme in Whorf's writing. Such metaphysical concepts of time, space, actor, matter, and so on are deducible, not by any one system in the grammar (verb tense or noun, for instance), but by "analyzing and reporting experiences which have become fixed in the language as integrated fashions of speaking." Lexical, morphological, syntactic, and other systematically diverse means are coordinated in a certain frame of consistency by native speakers. These differences in grammatical forms are said to reveal how language shapes a people's Weltanschauung, or world view which, in turn, is coordinated in many ways to habitual behavior.

For example, Hopi and SAE contrast markedly in a number of large-scale linguistic patterns. Striking differences are found in plurality and enumeration, nouns of physical quality, temporal forms of nouns and verbs, and concepts of duration, intensity, and tendency. Through such linguistic comparisons, Whorf then infers "certain dominant contrasts" in habitual thought which is then projected into behavior. Linkages between Hopi linguistic and non-linguistic forms may be expressed in shorthand fashion as follows:

Tenseless verb ——————→ lack of objectified time pattern ——→
——→ cultural emphasis on preparedness and repetition

SAE speakers, by contrast, split nouns into a form-plus-substance dichotomy (e.g. a glass of water) leading to a binary logic and dualistic conception of reality. Further, historicity, record-keeping, calendars, and even science are possible, Whorf inferred, because verb tenses are realized in an objectified sense of time.

Whorf speculated that the obligatory nature of language operates "behind" or "above" the focus of personal consciousness. In manipulating whole paradigms, words, classes, and grammatical orders, the thinker, in effect, is controlled by the structural boundaries of his language. Sub-linguistic perception, in this sense, is undoubtedly a primordial experience common to all men, but conscious awareness of sensations requires the linguistic apparatus.

Whorf resolved the problem of the mutual influence of language and culture by emphasizing the dominant role which linguistic patterns once established play. By limiting plasticity and rigidifying channels of development, language becomes the primary determinant of culture patterns. Meanings are thus locked into language categories. In turn, meanings control conduct.

As Fishman indicates, under the aegis of the Whorfian school, language itself is seen as an objective reality by means of which it structures and organizes the "out there" in certain characteristic ways.[5] The assumption, then, is that when languages differ maximally, the organizing schemata which their speakers impose on the non-linguistic world should also differ maximally.

Ethnographic Support of the Hypothesis: Whole-Language and Culture-Analysis

The impetus of Whorf's hypothesis had a salutory effect on linguistic and ethnographic work. In linguistics, for instance, the American formalistic orientation gradually gave way to a renewed concern with semantics and meaning analysis.[6] Some ethnographers, operating within the language-causation perspective, analyzed non-literate languages to discern the world-view that is incorporated in these various codification systems.

Malinowski's data on the Trobriand Islanders was the starting point for Dorothy Lee's investigation of this group's metaphysical assumptions (being, value, time, etc.) as these are articulated in the language and ceremonial life. In this analysis, language contains within it the premises of the culture, and "codifies reality in such a way that it presents it as absolute to the members of each culture."[7] Although, directionality is not explicitly stated, the implicit recognition that codification determines reality does seem apparent.

Kluckhohn and Leighton furnished data on the Navaho which supports the Whorfian thesis. The approach--from grammar classes and vocabulary to thought and behavior--is essentially that of Whorf's with some modification. While every language, they hold, "has an effect upon what the people who use it see, what they feel, how they think, what they can talk about," they add, that linguistic differentiations, "like other sorts of cultural selectivity, rest upon the historical experiences of the people."[8] This would suggest a culture-influences-language approach. Yet, the analysis of Navaho verbs as evidence of cognitive style makes the grammar-to-world-view analytic leap characteristically found in Whorf.

For example, Kluckhohn and Leighton contend that Navaho verb stems depend on the types of their subjects or objects (long-object class, granular

mass class, and so on), and fuse prefixes and other separable elements in accord with multitudinous alternatives. The excessively literal language, they conclude, is a consequence of this inner classification, and implies a highly concrete world-view with little scope for abstractions.

The problem with such analysis, of course, is that the very concepts of "concrete" and "abstract," would seem to be ethnocentrically-based. What is "concrete" and what "abstract," like the figure-and-ground problem in Gestalt psychology, may be in the mind of the beholder. Nevertheless, such data did give added credence to the Whorfian hypothesis.

Hoijer's work on the Navaho was a careful attempt to indicate functional interrelationships between socially patterned habits of speaking and thinking and other socially patterned habits.[9] Applying Whorf's technique of analysis, Hoijer claims that there are striking parallels between certain semantic themes and Navaho behavior. In three broad speech patterns, including conjugation of active herbs, reporting of actions and events, and the framing of substantive concepts, the Navaho stress the nature, direction, and status of movement in considerable detail. Correlated with this verbal orientation is the objective condition of Navaho nomadic life, which entails incessant movement from one pasturage to another. Further validation for Hoijer's correlations is furnished by Kluckhohn's non-linguistic data of the cultural postulates that underlie Navaho behavior.[10]

Critical Assessment of the Whorfian Hypothesis

Criticism focus on certain logical, methodological, and psychological difficulties inherent in the linguistic determinism argument. Such evaluations have stimulated various approaches to the language-culture problem, as in experimental work, ethnoscience, and a social contextual analysis to verbal behavior.

The critical question posed by Whorf and the whole-language and culture-analysis school revolves around the following point: do differences in language structure correlate or correspond to actual differences in ways of perceiving and conceiving the world, and thus affecting social behavior? Critical judgments have subsequently been aimed at not only the methodological weaknesses but also at the very conceptualization of the problem. Certain key criticisms are the following:

(1) The whole-patterns analysis, inherited from the work of Benedict and the early Culture and Personality School in Anthropology, is pre-scientific. The resulting research is impressionistic and intuitive, and lacks methodological and theoretical rigor.

(2) The principle of linguistic relativity, like the tenet of cultural relativity, is an assumption. Research suggests that the problem is more complex. Distinct cultures may have similar languages, while nearly identical cultures may possess distinctive languages.[11]

(3) A translation fallacy is implicit in Whorf's world-view thesis. The literal translations which Whorf offered of Indian phrases and sentences act to distort the significance of metaphors and historical changes of language.[12]

(4) A logical weakness is the circularity of inference implicit in Whorf's testing of the hypothesis.[13] A tautology is apparent as in the assertion that people perceive time differently from SAE speakers because their way of talking about it is different, and their way of talking about it is different, because they perceive differently.

(5) The assumption that language, thought and behavior categories are somehow equivalent provides the analytic leap from linguistic data to non-linguistic. This one-to-one correspondence has been rejected as untenable. Mauss (1900) holds for instance, that genders correspond to little more than linguistic survivals.[14] There is often a lack of a mirror relationship between linguistic and social categories. Investigation of these categories requires that the researcher operate within the frame of reference of the native speaker to extract relevant meanings.[15]

(6) Syntax and terminology do not necessarily inhibit any specific metaphysic. Aristotelian metaphysics has been expressed in such diverse languages as Syriac, Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin.[16] Classical Hebrew has ideas of "being," although the language possesses no abstract verb "to exist."

(7) The known facts of linguistic change, multilingualism, and cultural diffusion imply that autonomous culture change occurs. The absolute "tyranny" of language, in Sapir's words, does not prevent cultural exchange, translation, and new discriminations.[17]

Opposition also fastens on the inadequate field sampling (Newton), the premature categorization of linguistic items (Hockett), the failure to test alternative deterministic factors, such as history or belief systems (Greenberg), and the oversimplication of the purported social patterns.[18] Inherited linguistic patterns as these affect activities is least important in practical contexts, and most significant in myth, religion and philosophy. These different universes of discourse are really not commensurable.

The global approach of the Whorf School has now been abandoned. The illustrative and anecdotal materials which are presented to support the language-thought-culture argument have been rejected on the grounds that the procedure is

neither reliable nor valid. Three recent perspectives--the experimental approach in psycholinguistics, ethnoscience in anthropology, and social contextual analysis in sociology--have attempted, on the one hand, to subject the thesis to more rigorous testing, and on the other, to account for the strategic role of language in social relations.

In doing so, the original problem has been subsequently altered. Emphasis has focused on the development of limited propositions that assert the interrelatedness of language, cognition, and social conduct.

Experimental Evidence

Psycholinguistics includes a range of research interests. Studies of special interest are color perception and terminologies, ease or difficulty of codability, the influence of grammatical categories, and visual illusions.[19] While the problems are diverse, the research purpose has a common aim. Experiments attempt to systematically establish the type, degree, and conditions under which relations between codification (or speech behavior), cognition, and behavior may be said to exist.

Experimental findings suggest caution in any premature assumptions about the unidirectionality of linguistic behavior as affecting non-linguistic. For instance, increased use of categories, usually leads to shorter names, or higher codability. Color perception, however, may occur even without codification.[20] Language is not, then, the only experience man has with which to organize his perceptual field. Experiments on Navaho and English speaking children in Boston show that practice with objects or toys may be an instrumental in form-matching as learning a language such as Navaho with its grammatical categories of form and material.[21] The cross-cultural differences noted in geometrical illusion susceptibility do point to distinct Whorfian effects. That is,

environmental factors (size and shape of objects) tend to affect perception through the linguistic forms. Westerners do "see" differently from non-Westerners, which is a joint function of environmental and linguistic differences.[22] There is no simple cause (language), however, leading to an effect (behavior).

Ethnoscience or Folk Taxonomies

Recent work in cognitive anthropology aims at deriving the principles by which a people classify their universe.[23] Methods of discovering and describing cognitive systems include semantic categorization of native terminology, thus "discerning how people construe their world of experience from the way they talk about it."[24] Culture is here identified with cognition.

Codability, whether in color or disease terms, or in time-space experiences, does reveal significant cultural properties. In Frake's research among the Subanuns of the Philippines, he found that the apparent inconsistencies in disease concepts could be understood by recognizing the different levels of contrast. In this scheme, distinct, exclusive categories of illness were found at each level of contrast. Naming of illness has direct implications for behavior. Role performances, bride price calculations, and joking and drinking behavior are intricately related to communication of disease.

An analysis of noun classes and folk taxonomy in Papago by Mathiot shows a close affinity between linguistic patterns and perception. Papago speakers tend to indicate gradual, rather than yes/no or binary, oppositions. The supposed universality of a two-valued logic may be doubtful if perception is indeed a function of specific linguistic structures.[25]

In much of the work to date, ethnoscience research provides nice illustrations of the cultural relativity of semantic distinctions, and behavioral effects consequent from such codification systems. Objections have been raised,

however, to the notion that any single analysis reveals much about a people's cognitive structure. Folk taxonomies are partial tools, at best. Burling holds that a structural semantics approach which relates two observable types of data--language use and events in the nonlinguistic world--is more promising for working out the set of rules which guide a group's behavior.[26]

Social Contextual Analysis

In a very crucial sense, the linguistic determinism thesis has been abandoned--some would say, prematurely. Findings from experimental and field work studies point to the multiplicity of variables involved, the difficulty of establishing directionality, and the changing phenomenon of language itself. A so-called partial determinism, or possibilistic view, as articulated by Hymes and Carroll has set the tone for an analysis of semantic habits as these relate to the sociocultural context.[27]

Recent sociolinguistic research looks to the partial dependencies between properties of linguistic systems, on the one hand, and characteristics of the users, and circumstances of the use, on the other. The equation of one language - one culture is invalid, when levels of communication, social situations, dialect variations, and other indicators of heterogeneity are recognized. Research trends demonstrate, for instance, the various levels of communication, as in Hall's study of formal, informal, or technical forms of language use.[28] The "situation," as a crucial variable, is now admitted.[29] Speech forms are seen to vary by class and social experience, producing distinctive linguistic codes, as in Bernstein's analysis of restricted and elaborated codes.[30] Talk, as socially organized encounters, is analyzed as meanings-in-use.[31]

"Residual" or "deep" rules, which subtely govern social conduct, are investigated by ethnomethodology, a recent perspective in sociology. "Fringe

meanings" of words are connoted by a variety of indicators: vocabulary, syntax, phonetic variations, tone of the speaker and other linguistic or verbal clues, as well as dress, social status, biography, gesture, posture, and other paralinguistic symbols. These combine to communicate the intent of the speaker, and not merely the verbal content.[32]

Language, in this context, becomes a methodological strategy to explore linkages between what is said and the nature of the social scene. The God's Truth School, which holds that the semantic structure is the key to culture and social organization, makes little sense to investigators operating in a differentiated semantic domain. Linguistic relativity receives strong support in this research, but the sources of the variation are seen in the social order, rather than in the language per se. The most significant contribution, however, is the eradication of the formal distinction between language (la langue) and speech (la parole). Instead of the analytically distinct entities articulated by De Saussure and others, formal properties and meanings-in-use are seen as a single entity. This conjoining of formerly separate spheres may, yet, have its most profound impact on creating a science of man that is based on language and the rules of thought.

Language and Social Structure - Toward a Linguistically Based Social Science

Relativism seems a less viable position today. A counter-trend is emerging under the impact of linguistic, psychological, and comparative studies that aim at establishing a set of general principles and interrelated laws that underlie all organized behavior. Here, I can only be suggestive.

Levi-Strauss, a French social anthropologist, is undoubtedly the leading proponent of the position that social things are of the same order as mental

regularities. In applying the rules of logic to the analysis of social forms, Levi-Strauss analyses social systems in terms of linguistic systems, "built by the mind on the level of unconscious thought." Even as structural linguistics orders the vast diversity of sounds and meanings, social scientists should dissect the logical operations that underly social principles of order. Such principles, he assumed are finite and universal, but capable of generating an infinite number of possible specific orderings. The social scientist, in this formulation, should concentrate on forms, not content, for understanding basic social laws.[33] The theoretical work of Piaget, Chomsky, and Greenberg also reflect the effort to develop universalistic statements regarding the nature of man.[34]

Conclusions

My own view of this very promising trend is that American social scientists will continue to lag behind European formulations in erecting a linguistically-based social science. The strong commitment to a "middle range" theoretical position which can only generate limited and probabilistic propositions will undoubtedly hinder this more rationalistic, and wholistic approach. There is no doubt, however, that American sociology, social psychology, and anthropology will continue to modify their conceptual tools, in order to account more adequately for the role of language in an understanding of the construction of social order. The Sapir-Whorf legacy may be only now coming into its own.

FOOTNOTES

1. I am indebted to Bo Anderson, Professor of Sociology, Michigan State University for his helpful discussions of this paper. Bernard N. Meltzer, Professor of Sociology, Central Michigan University, also provided invaluable editorial assistance.

2. The earliest formulation of this cognition-language bond and which predated the work of Whorf is found in L. Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, English translation by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuiness. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, (1961). The anthropologist, Edward Sapir, early made the theoretical link between culture, language, and behavior that set the theoretical problem for later social scientists. (See E. Sapir, Culture, Language and Personality. Edited by D.G. Mandelbaum. Berkeley: University of California Press, (1964); and Language. New York: Harcourt and Brace, (1921)). Whorf, however, while working within the Sapir paradigm, extended the conceptual work into actual field observations. (See Benjamin L. Whorf, Language, Thought and Reality. Edited by John B. Carroll. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, (1956)).

   Some recommended works dealing with the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis include: Ian D. Currie, "The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis: A Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge." In J.E. Curtis and John W. Petras, (ed.), Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1970; Susan Ervin, "Language and Thought." In Sol Tax, Horizons in Anthropology. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, (1964); and Josua Fishman, "A Systematization of the Whorfian Hypothesis." Behavioral Science: 5 (1960), pp.323-339.

3. Sapir, op. cit., 1964, p. 162.

4. This is the position taken by Wittgenstein. This assumption is also very close to the pragmatic position of G.H. Mead, Baldwin, Dewey, Cooley and others of the "Chicago School," who insisted on the priority of the social for development of the mind.

5. Fishman, op. cit.

6. Dell Hymes, (ed.), Language in Culture and Sociology. New York: Harper & Row, (1964), esp. p. 117.

7. Dorothy Lee, "Being and Value in a Primitive Culture." The Journal of Philosophy: 46 (1949), pp. 401-415.

8. Clyde Kluckhohn and Dorothea Leighton, "By Their Speech Shall Ye Know Them." J. Jennings and E.A. Adamson, (eds.). Readings in Anthropology. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, (1966), pp. 378-384.

9. Harry Hoijer, "The Relation of Language to Culture." In A.L. Kroeber, (ed.), Anthropology Today. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, (1953), pp. 554-573.

10. Clyde Kluckhohn and Dorothea Leighton. The Navaho. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, (1946).

11. See, for example, J.O. Bright, and W. Bright, "Semantic Structures in Northwestern California and the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis." American Anthropologist 67 (1965), pp. 249-258.

12. Currie, op. cit.

13. Eric H. Lenneberg, "Cognition in Ethnolinguistics," Language 29 (1953) pp. 463-471.

14. M. Mauss, "On Language and Primitive Forms of Classification." In Hymes, (ed.), op. cit. pp. 125-127.

15. Ward H. Goodenough. "Language and Property in Truk: Some Methodological Considerations." In Hymes, (ed.), op. cit., pp.185-188.

16. This is discussed in Currie, op. cit.

17. Hymes, op. cit., p. 117.

18. A general critique of this work is found in Harry Hoijer, (ed.). Language in Culture. Memoir No. 79. American Anthropology Association. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1954).

19. Representative work in this area include: Roger Brown and Eric Lenneberg, "A Study in Language and Cognition." In Sol Saporta (ed.), Psycholinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, (1961), pp. 480-492; John B. Carroll and Joseph B. Casagrande, "The Function of Language Classifications in Behavior." In E. Maccoby, T.M. Newcomb, and E.L. Hartley, (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, (1958), pp. 18-31; Marshall H. Segall, Donald T. Campbell, Melville J. Herskovits, The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., (1966).

20. Brown and Lenneberg, in Saporta, (ed.), op. cit., p. 92.

21. Carroll and Casagrande in Maccoby, et. al. (eds.), pp. 18-31.

22. Seegal, Campbell, and Herskovits, op. cit.

23. See, for example: William C. Sturtevant, "Studies in Ethnoscience." American Anthropologist: 66 (1964), pp. 99-131, and Stephen Tyler, (ed.), Cognitive Anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston (1970).

24. Charles O. Frake, "The Diagnosis of Disease Among the Subanun of Mindanao." In Hymes, (ed.) op. cit., p. 193.

25. Madeleine Mathiot, "Noun Classes and Folk Taxonomy in Papago." In Hymes, (ed.), op. cit., pp. 154-161.

26. Robbins Burling, "Cognition and Componential Analysis: God's Truth or Hocus-Pocus?" American Anthropologist: 66 (1964), pp. 20-28.

27. See Hymes, op. cit., p. xxvii and John B. Carroll, The Study of Language. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1953).

28. Edward T. Hall, "Adumbration as a Feature of Intercultural Communication." American Anthropologist: 66 (1964).

29. Erving Goffman, "The Neglected Situation." American Anthropologist: 66 (1964).

30. Basil Bernstein, "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Consequences." American Anthropologist: 66 (1964).

31. Charles O. Frake, "How To Ask For a Drink in Sabanun." American Anthropologist: 66 (1964). The above four citations (footnotes 28-31) are all taken from the same volume of American Anthropologist: The Ethnography of Communication: 66 (1964). For other representative work in Sociolinguistics, see Joshua A. Fishman, (ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton (1968).

32. See Peter K. Manning, "Language, Meaning and Action." To appear in Jack D. Douglas, Introduction to Sociology: Situations and Structures. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

33. Claude Levi-Strauss, Structural Anthropology. Translated by C. Jacobson and B.G. Schoeff. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967.

34. See Roger Brown for an overview of Piaget's thought, especially Chapter 5. R. Brown, Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press (1965). N. Chomsky, Syntactic Structures. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, (1957). J.H. Greenberg, (ed.), Universals of Language. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PAPERS FROM THE
MICHIGAN LINGUISTIC SOCIETY MEETING

October 3, 1970

Edited by

David Lawton

President, Hans Fetting 1970-71

Treasurer, James Stalker 1970-71

Editor, David Lawton 1970-71

Volume 1, Number 2